

# Kushke Martens Olson & Bear LLP

Intellectual Property Law



COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

550 West C Street  
Suite 1200  
San Diego CA 92101  
Tel 619-235-8530  
Fax 619-235-0176  
www.kmob.com

John M. Carson  
619-887-8632  
jcarson@kmob.com

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

AUG - 7 2002

RECEIVED

July 26, 2002

VIA FACSIMILE AND AIR MAIL

Ms. Winnie Tham  
ALLEN & GLEDHILL  
36 Robinson Road  
#18-01, City House  
068877 SINGAPORE

Re: INTEGRATED CIRCUIT INDUCTOR STRUCTURE FOR REDUCING  
DISTRIBUTED CAPACITANCE SUBSTRATE  
Application No.: 09/737,439  
Filed: December 13, 2000  
Your Reference No.: SG 200002874-6  
Our Reference No.: ALLENG2.001AUS

Dear Winnie:

This is to inform you that we have conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner regarding the above-identified patent application as requested in your letter dated June 25, 2002. First of all, we are pleased to advise you that all of the claims of the application will be allowed. The facts regarding this interview will follow.

After we prepared a table and reference drawings showing the distinct differences between the claimed invention and the Abide reference, we tried several times to arrange an interview with Examiner Ha. However, he refused to participate in an interview with us indicating that he does not interview after a final Office Action unless an amendment is submitted citing USPTO guidelines, specifically MPEP 713.09. A copy of the citation is enclosed for your reference. This requirement was contrary to my years of experience. Even more surprisingly, Examiner Ha would not even allow us to fax him the table and marked-up drawings.

After we determined that the MPEP citation did not support Examiner Ha's position (and even specified the contrary policy, i.e., that interviews are normally granted after final status and may be denied if claim amendments are to be proposed.), we contacted Supervisory Examiner Olik Chaudhuri. Examiner Chaudhuri allowed us to provide him with the table and drawings. After reviewing the material that we faxed to him, Examiner Chaudhuri has indicated that all of the claims are allowed without any amendments.

Newport Beach  
949-760-0404

San Francisco  
415-854-4114

Los Angeles  
310-551-3450

Riverside  
909-781-9231

**Kushle Martens Olson & Dear LLP**

Ms. Winnie Tham

July 29, 2002

Page -2-

After we receive a Notice of Allowance from the USPTO, we will forward it to you. We appreciate your cooperation and support with regard to this matter.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Most sincerely,

John M. Carson

Enclosure

S:\DOCS\HZC\HZC-2356.DOC  
072602



COPY OF PAPERS  
ORIGINALLY FILED

EXAMINATION OF APPLICATIONS

RECEIVED  
AUG 7 1997  
TECHNOL. CTR.  
SEP 2 1997

714

**No Inter Partes Questions  
Discussed Ex Parte**

The examiner may not discuss *inter partes* questions *ex parte* with any of the interested parties.

**713.07 Exposure of Other Cases**

Prior to an interview in the examiner's room, the examiner should arrange his or her desk so that all files, drawings and other papers, except those necessary in the interview, are placed out of view. See MPEP § 101.

**713.08 Demonstration, Exhibits, Models**

The invention in question may be exhibited or demonstrated during the interview by a model thereof. A model received by the examiner from the applicant or his or her attorney which complies with 37 CFR 1.91 and which is made part of the application record must be properly recorded on the "Contents" portion of the application file wrapper. See MPEP § 608.03 and § 608.03(a).

Oftentimes a model or exhibit is not given into the custody of the Office but is brought directly into the group by the attorney solely for inspection or demonstration during the course of the interview. This is permissible. If the model or exhibit is merely used for demonstration purpose and is not made part of the record (does not comply with 37 CFR 1.91), a full description as to what was demonstrated/exhibited must be made of record in the application. See 37 CFR 1.133(b). Demonstrations of apparatus or exhibits too large to be brought into the Office may be viewed by the examiner outside of the Office (in the Washington, D.C. area) with the approval of the supervisory patent examiner. It is presumed that the witnessing of the demonstration or the reviewing of the exhibit is actually essential in the developing and clarifying of the issues involved in the application.

**713.09 Finally Rejected Application**

Normally, one interview after final rejection is permitted. However, prior to the interview, the intended purpose and content of the interview should be presented briefly, preferably in writing. Such an interview may be granted if the examiner is convinced that disposal or clarification for appeal may be accom-

plished with only nominal further consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations which would require more than nominal reconsideration or new search should be denied. See MPEP § 714.13.

Interviews may be held after the expiration of the shortened statutory period and prior to the maximum permitted statutory period of 6 months without an extension of time. See MPEP § 706.07(f).

A second or further interview after a final rejection may be held if the examiner is convinced that it will expedite the issues for appeal or disposal of the application.

**713.10 Interview Preceding Filing  
Amendment Under 37 CFR  
1.312**

After an application is sent to issue, it is technically no longer under the jurisdiction of the primary examiner. 37 CFR 1.312. An interview with an examiner that would involve a detailed consideration of claims sought to be entered and perhaps entailing a discussion of the prior art for determining whether or not the claims are allowable should not be given. Obviously an applicant is not entitled to a greater degree of consideration in an amendment presented informally than is given an applicant in the consideration of an amendment when formally presented, particularly since consideration of an amendment filed under 37 CFR 1.312 cannot be demanded as a matter of right.

Requests for interviews on cases where a notice of allowance has been mailed should be granted only with specific approval of the Technology Center Director upon a showing in writing of extraordinary circumstances.

**714 Amendments, Applicant's Action**

**37 CFR 1.121. Manner of making amendments in application.**

(a) *Amendments in applications, other than reissue applications.* Amendments in applications, other than reissue applications, are made by filing a paper, in compliance with § 1.52, directing that specified amendments be made.

(b) *Specification other than the claims and listings provided for elsewhere (§§ 1.96 and 1.825).*—

(1) *Amendment by instruction to delete, replace, or add a paragraph.* Amendments to the specification, other than the